

No. 9(1)-82-PV-61.ab/10257.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Haryana Industries, 432, Rohtak Road, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 192 of 1980

between

SHRI ARM KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF HARYANA  
INDUSTRIES, 432, ROHTAK ROAD, BAHADURGARH.

Present:

Shri Harish Aggarwal for the workman.

Shri M. M. Kaushal, for the management.

### AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor,—vide his order No. ID/SPT/27-80/50238, dated 19th September, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Ram Kumar, workman and the management of Haryana Industries, Bahadurgarh. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Kumar was justified and in order? If not to what relief is the entitled?

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties put in their appearance, filed their respective pleadings, issues were framed and the management was asked to adduce their evidence. The management obtained several adjournments for the production of their evidence. At last on 31st August, 1982 the parties arrived at an amicable settlement and the statement of the workman representatives was recorded as under :—

"In view of the statement given in application No 80 of 1982 I have left no dispute with the management and shall have no right of reinstatement or reemployment left. No dispute award be given in term of the statement."

In view of his statement no further adjudication is required as the parties settled the dispute and referred to this court amicably and there remains no dispute left between the parties. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated, the 18th September, 1982.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2207, dated the 28th September, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 9 (1) 82-PV-6 Lab 10267.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the Dispute between the workmen and the management of M/S Haryana Steel and Alloys Ltd. G.T. Road Murthal Distt. Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 89 of 1982

between

THE WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA STEEL AND  
ALLOYS LTD., G. T. ROAD MURTHAL DISTT. SONIPAT

Present:—

Shri V. K. Sachar for the workman.

Shri S. N. Sharma for the management.

## AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor,—vide his order No. ID/SPT/80-79/22961 dated 20th May, 1982 under section 10 (!) (c) of the I. D. Act for adjudication of the dispute existing between the workmen and the management of M/s Haryana Steel and Alloys Ltd. Murthal. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of the following workmen was justified and in order? If not to what relief they are entitled?

1. Devi Ram
2. Ram Dhir
3. Jai Singh
4. Rajinder Singh
5. Om Parkash
6. Horiya
7. Daya Chand
8. Mahar Singh
9. Maha Singh

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties put in their appearance in response to the same on 7th July, 1982. After obtaining two adjournments for filing of their claim statements by the workman, the representatives of the parties made the following statement on 1st September, 1982.

*Statement of Shri V. K. Sachar, representative of the workmen.—*

"In spite of my repeated intimations to the workmen by personally messenger and letters none has turned up. It appears that they are not interested in pursuing their cases. Accordingly union withdraws the case. The award may be given accordingly."

*Statement of Shri S. N. Sharma, personnel Officer, respondent: —*

"I have heard above statement which is correct. None of the persons were our employee as is clear from attendance record brought by me today."

In view of their statements no further adjudication is required as the concerned workmen are not interested in pursuing their demands leading to the present reference as none of them were employee of the respondent concern and there is no dispute left between the parties. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated 23rd September, 1982

BANWARI LAL DALAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2217, dated 28th September, 1982

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 9(1)82-PV/6Lab./10268.—In pursuance of the provision of the section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Mechanical Movements Pvt. Ltd., T/3 Industrial Area, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK  
Reference No. 10 of 1981  
between

SHRI SHYAM LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MECHANICAL  
MOVEMENTS PVT. LTD., T/3, INDUSTRIAL AREA, BAHADURGARH.

Present.—

Shri Harish Aggarwal, for the workman.

Shri M. M. Kaushal, for the management.

## AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor, *vide* his order No. ID//SPT-160-8/60540, dated 17th December, 1981 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Shyam Lal, workman and management of M/s Mechanical Movements Pvt. Ltd. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Sham Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties appeared, filed their respective pleadings, issues were framed and the management was asked to adduce their evidence. After obtaining five six adjournment, for the same the parties arrived at an amicable settlement and the statement of the authorized representative of the workman was recorded on 31st August, 1982 as under :—

“The workman has accepted the sum of Rs. 1,500 to be paid by the management for settling all his disputes and claims including his right of reinstatement or re-employment. No dispute award be given in lieu of the above settlement.”

In view of his statement no further adjudication is required as the parties settled the dispute referred to this court amicably and there remains no dispute left between the parties. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated the 23rd September, 1982.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2218, dated the 28th September, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana  
Rohtak.

No. 9(1)-82-PV-6Lab/10269.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s New Haryana Udyog, MIE Bahadurgarh, District Rohtak.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LAECUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 11 of 1982

*Between*

SHRI KISHAN LAL WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S NEW  
HARYANA UDYOG, MIE BAHADURGARH, DISTRICT, ROHTAK

*present.*

No one for either side.

## AWARD

This reference has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, *vide* his order No. ID/RTK/ 181-81/629, dated 5th January, 1982 under section 10 (i) (c) of

the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Kishan Lal workman and the management of M/s New Haryana Udyog, Bahadurgarh. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Kishan Lal workman was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The workman appeared through his authorised representative on 26th February, 1982 but no one appeared on behalf of the management. The management was issued with another fresh registered A.D. notice for 29th March, 1982. On this date of hearing also no one was present for either side and fresh notices for 28th July, 1982 were again issued to the parties. On 28th July 1982 also no one was present on behalf of the workman despite the service of notice to him and the A. D. was on the file. The notice sent to the management was received back unserved with remarks of the postman "Left without address".

Under these circumstances it was presumed that the workman is not interested in pursuing his demand leading to the present reference and there is no dispute left between the parties. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated the 23rd September, 1982.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endst. No. 2219, dated the 28th September, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 9(1)82-PV-6Lab/10270.— In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. New Haryana Udyog, MIE, Bahadurgarh. District Rohtak.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 6 of 1982

*between*

SHRI MUNI LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S NEW HARYANA  
UDYOG, MIE, BAHADURGARH, DISTRICT ROHTAK

*Present :—*

No one for either side.

#### AWARD

This reference has been referred to this Court, by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. 10/RPK/182-21/379, dated 4th January, 1982 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Muni Lal workman and the management of M/s New Haryana Udyog, MIE Bahadurgarh. The term of the reference was:

Whether the termination of services of Shri Muni Lal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The workman appeared thorough his authorised representative on 26th February, 1982 but no one appeared on behalf of the management. The management was issued with another fresh Registered A.D. notice for 29th March, 1982. On this date of hearing also no one was present for either side and fresh notices for 28th July, 1982 were again issued to the parties. On 28th July, 1982 also no one was present on behalf of the workman despite the service of notice to him. The A.D. was on the file and the notice sent to the Management was received back unserved with remarks of the postman "left without address".

Under these circumstances it is presumed that the workman is not interested in pursuing his demand leading to the present reference and there is no dispute left between the parties. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Dated the 23rd September, 1982.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2220, dated the 28th September, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 9(1)82-PV-6Lab./10272.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bhiwani Textile Mills, Bhiwani.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR, COURT  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 77 of 1981

between

SHRI DHARAM PAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHIWANI TEXTILE  
MILLS, BHIWANI

Present:—

No one for the workman.

Shri Shyam Lal for the management.

#### AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor.—vide his order No. ID/HSR/51-81/26607, dated 26th May, 1981 under section 10 (i) (c) of the I. D. Act for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Dharam Pal, workman and the management of M/s Bhiwani Textile Mills, Bhiwani. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Dharam Pal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The management appeared through their representative Shri Shyam Lal but no one appeared on behalf of the workman in response to the same on 10th August, 1981. The workman was proceeded ex parte. The management obtained several adjournments for production of their ex parte evidence. Shri Shyam Lal appeared

as management witness deposed that the workman had received his full and final dues and for that very reason the workman was not attending the court since the start of proceedings. He further stated that no dispute of the workman survives against the management.

I have no reason but to believe *ex parte* statement of the management witness which goes unbuttressed. Relying on his statement I hold that the workman has cleared his full and final accounts with the management and after this no dispute survives against the management which has led to the present reference. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated 24th September, 1982.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2222 dated 28th September 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 9(1)82-PV-6Lab./10006.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Proven Plastic (P) Ltd., 44 K.M., Mathura Road, Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 41/1981

*between*

SHRI DHARAMBIR WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PROVEN PLASTIC (P)  
LTD., 44 K.M. MATHURA ROAD, BALLABGARH

*Present. —*

Shri G. S. Chaudhary, for the workman.

Shri R. Gogna, for the management.

#### AWARD

The Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Dharambir and the management of M/s Proven Plastic (P) Ltd., 44 K.M. Mathura Road, Ballabgarh, by order No. ID/FD/2/81/8566, dated 16th February, 1981, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Dharambir was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference were sent to the parties who appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed by my order dated the 29th May, 1981 :—

- (1) Whether the workman resigned of his own?
- (2) Whether the reference is bad on account of error in discibing the name of management?
- (3) Whether the termination of services of Shri Dharmbir was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is entitled?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management who produced Shri Samsudin workman as MW-1, Shri Sahabudin workman as MW-2, Shri Vijay Vishni, Manager as MW-3, and Shri Baldev Singh

as MW-4 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman did not produce any evidence rather made a statement that he withdrew the present reference. In view of the statement of the workman, it is needless to discuss the evidence led by the management. The reference is dismissed as withdrawn. No order as to cost.

Dated the 21st September, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement. No. 1018, dated 22nd September, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Th. 15th October, 1982

No. 9(1) 82-PV-6Lab/9996.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Paul Rubber Works, Plot No. 9, N. I. T., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 76 of 1982

between

SHRI HARGIAN SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PAUL RUBBER  
WORKS, PLOT NO. 9, N. I. T. FARIDABAD

Present:—

Shri Manohar Lal for the workman.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

The Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Hargian Singh and the management of M/s Paul Rubber Works Plot No. 9, N. I. T., Faridabad, by order No. 1D/FD/21/82/9890, dated 9th March, 1982, to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:

Whether the termination of service of Shri Hargian Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference were issued to the parties. The workman appeared but the management refused to receive the notice of the case. Therefore, a U.P.C. notice under rule 18 of the Industrial Disputes Punjab Rules, 1958 was also sent but the management failed to appear despite it. The management proceeded ex parte and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. In evidence the workman examined himself and deposed that he worked in the respondent factory for the last 12 years. His work was satisfactory. He was removed from service without any charge-sheet or enquiry on 7th November, 1981 because he had made a complaint against the management that their Provident Fund and E. S. I were deducted.

Believing the *ex parte* statement of the workman, I find that the order of the termination of the service was wrongful. Therefore, I give my award that the workman is entitled to his reinstatement with full back wages.

—Dated the 15th September, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1008, dated 22nd September, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 12th/15th October, 1982

No. 9(1)82-PV-6Lab./9999.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Paul Rubber Works, Plot No. 9, N.I.T., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 77/1982

between

SHRI BADAM SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PAUL RUBBER  
WORKS, PLOT NO. 9, N. I. T. FARIDABAD

Shri Manohar Lal, for the workman.

Nemo for the management.

#### AWARD

The Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Badam Singh, and the management of M/s Paul Rubber Works, Plot No. 9, Faridabad, by order No. 9883, dated 9th March, 1982, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :

Whether the termination of service of Shri Badam Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference were issued to parties. The workman appeared but the management refused to receive the notice of the case. Therefore, a U.P.C. notice under rule 18 of the Industrial Disputes Punjab Rules, 1958 was also sent but the management failed to appear despite it. The management was proceeded *ex parte* and the case was fixed for evidence of the workman. In evidence the workman examined himself and deposed that he worked in respondent factory for the last 15 years. His work was satisfactory. He was removed from service without any reason, charge-sheet or enquiry because he had made a complaint against the management that their Provident Fund and E.S.I. were not deducted.

Believing the *ex parte* statement of the workman, I find that the order of termination of service was wrongful. Therefore, I give my award that the workman is entitled to his reinstatement with full back wages.

Dated the 15th September, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.



Endorsement No. 1011, dated the 22nd September, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I.D. Act, 1947

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-PV-6Lab/10000. - In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s AAR PEE Timbers, SSI Plot No. 3, NH-2 NIT Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 139 of 1982

between

SHRI BHOLA RAM YADAV, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S AAR PEE  
TIMBERS SSI, PLOT NO. 3, NH-2, NIT FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri G. R. Arya, for the workman.

Nemo, for the management.

#### AWARD

The Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Bhola Ram Yadav and the management of M/s AAR PEE Timbers SSI Plot No. 3, NH-2, NIT Faridabad, by order No. 139/1982 to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Bhola Ram Yadav was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference were sent to the parties who appeared and the case was fixed for filing the written statement. On the date fixed, the workman was present but none appeared on behalf of the management. The management was proceeded *ex parte* and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman. In evidence the workman examined himself and deposed that he had worked in this factory from November, 1980 at Rs. 450/- per month as a machine operator. He met with accident on 27th January, 1982 while he was working on machine and two fingers of his right hand were cut off. He was removed from service without any reason, charge-sheet or warning on 16th February, 1982.

Believing the *ex parte* statement of the workman, I find that the order of termination of service was wrongful. Therefore, I give my award that the workman is entitled to his reinstatement with full back wages.

Dated the 16th September, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1012, dated the 22nd September, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

M. KUTTAPPAN,  
for Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana,  
Labour and Employment Departments.